UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/791,194	03/02/2004	Frank L. Hall	4718.2US (00-0316.02/US)	1948	
24247 TRASK BRITT					
P.O. BOX 2550	0 CITY, UT 84110		HEINRICH, S	SAMUEL M	
SALI LAKE C	2111, 01 04110		ALL DATE  4718.2US (00-0316.02/US)  1948  EXAMINER  HEINRICH, SAMUEL M  ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER  1725  DELIVERY MODE		
•			1725		
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MO	NTHS	04/09/2007	PAPER		

# Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
		10/791,194	HALL, FRANK	L.
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
•	*	Samuel M. Heinrich	1725	
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with th	e correspondence	address
A SH WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANSIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Depriod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period vere to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply b will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS f , cause the application to become ABANDO	ION. e timely filed from the mailing date of this DNED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status				
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 Ja	anuany 2007		
· · —	·	anuary 2007. action is non-final.		
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowar		prospoution as to t	ha marite is
الــارە	closed in accordance with the practice under E	•	•	ne memo is
D:14		in parte Quayle, 1000 C.D. 11	, 400 0.0. 210.	
· _	ion of Claims	•		
	Claim(s) $1-6$ is/are pending in the application.			
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray	wn from consideration.	·	
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
	Claim(s) <u>1-6</u> is/are rejected.	·		•
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8)[]	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.		
Applicati	ion Papers			
9)	The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.		
10)⊠	The drawing(s) filed on 02 March 2004 is/are:	a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objecte	d to by the Examin	er.
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance.	See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	•
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct			
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex			
Priority ι	under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign  All b) Some * c) None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	∂(a)-(d) or (f).	
a)	1.☐ Certified copies of the priority document:	s have been received		
	Certified copies of the priority documents	,	eation No	
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	al Stago
	application from the International Bureau	•	ived in this Nation	ai Stage
* 5	See the attached detailed Office action for a list		nived .	
		or the certified copies not rece	avea.	
		•		
Attachmen	(t(c)			
_	te of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Summ	iany (PTO-413)	
	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Ma	il Date	
3) 🛛 Infon	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) or No(s)/Mail Date 8 sheets.		al Patent Application	
po		·,,		•

Application/Control Number: 10/791,194

Art Unit: 1725

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of USPN 5,950,071 to Hammond et al and in view of USPN 5,023,424 to Vaught and further in view of either of USPN 6,297,138 to Rimai et al or in view of USPN 5,930,606 to McCulloch. AAPA discloses (Background of the Invention, Specification pages 2-6) well known use of a laser for material removal from a workpiece surface. Hammond et al discloses (Title) Detachment and Removal of Microscopic Surface Contaminants Using a Pulsed Detach Light and discloses (column 2, lines 17-26) laser ablation which both removes particles and micro-roughens the surface. Vaught describe (Abstract) a particle removing method comprising scanning. or locating and storing, of locations of particles on a workpiece surface. Both Rimai et al (column 2, lines 16-22) and McCulloch (column 2, lines 18-46) disclose laser operation which changes the surface material property of roughness and thereby improves subsequent adhesion to the surface. The use of a removal and roughening method as disclosed by Hammond et al with a locating or scanning step as disclosed by Vaught in the well known AAPA processes of cleaning and subsequent adhesion of a compound to a surface would have been obvious at the time applicant's invention was

Application/Control Number: 10/791,194

Art Unit: 1725

made to a person having ordinary skill in the art because finding the particles prior to cleaning is known as disclosed by Vaught and laser material removal is disclosed by all the references. Use of a rough surface for improving a subsequent bond is very well known and the instant roughening with a laser is known and described by Hammond et al in a cleaning method and described by Rimai et al and McCulloch in methods of improving surface material properties for subsequent adhesion thereto.

### Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed January 11, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the references are in a similar field. Hammond et al is drawn to removal of surface particles using laser. Vaught is cited on the front page of Hammond et al. Both Rimai et al and McCulloch were found in the U.S. Patent database using these search terms: (laser with improv\$5 with adhe\$7) same ((semiconduct\$4 silicon wafer chip die) with rough\$5).

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections

are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208
USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

#### Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Samuel M. Heinrich whose telephone number is 571-272-1175. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, P. Ryan can be reached on 571-272-1292. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/791,194

Art Unit: 1725

Page 5

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Samuel M Heinrich Primary Examiner Art Unit 1725